

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

### A. Background

1. Name of Proponent: San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
2. Address and Phone Number of Proponent:  
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board  
1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400  
Oakland, Ca 94612
3. Date Checklist Submitted:
4. Agency Requiring Checklist: Resources Agency
5. Name of Proposal, if Applicable: Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for San Francisco Bay to incorporate site-specific objectives and implementation plan for dissolved concentrations of copper and nickel in Lower South SF Bay.

### B. Environmental Impacts (Explanations are included on attached sheets).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING.</u>				
Would the proposal:				
a. Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b. Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c. Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d. Affect agriculture resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
II. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING.</u>				
Would the proposal:				
a. Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

	Potentially Significant Impact [ ]	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated [ ]	Less Than Significant Impact [ ]	No Impact [X]
b. Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?				
c. Displace existing housing especially affordable housing?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

### III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS

Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
a. Fault rupture?				
b. Seismic ground shaking?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c. Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d. Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e. Landslides or mudflows?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
f. Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
g. Subsidence of the land?	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
h. Expansive soils?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
i. Unique geologic or physical features?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

### IV. WATER

Would the proposal result in:				
a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c. Discharge into surface water or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e. Changes in currents or the course or direction of surface water movements?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
f. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of ground water recharge capability?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
g. Altered direction or rate of flow of ground water?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

	Potentially Significant Impact [ ]	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated [ ]	Less Than Significant Impact [ ]	No Impact [X]
h. Impacts to ground water quality?				

i. Substantial reduction in the amount of ground water otherwise available for public water supplies?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
---	-----	-----	-----	-----

V. AIR QUALITY

Would the proposal:

a. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c. Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d. Create objectionable odors?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Would the proposal result in:

a. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b. Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. farm equipment)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d. Insufficient parking capacity on- site or off-site?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
f. Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
g. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicyclists racks)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the proposal result in impacts to:

a. Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b. Locally designated species?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c. Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d. Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e. Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the proposal:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Use non- renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### IX. HAZARDS

Would the proposal involve:

a. A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### X. NOISE

Would the proposal result in:

a. Increases in existing noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### XI. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the proposal have an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

a. Power or natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Sewer or septic tanks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Solid waste disposal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Local or regional water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### XIII. AESTHETICS

Would the proposal:

a. Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Create light or glare?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the proposal:

a. Disturb paleontological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Disturb archaeological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Affect historical resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### XV. RECREATION

Would the proposal:

a. Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Affect existing recreational opportunities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage or long-term, environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact [ ]	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated [ ]	Less Than Significant Impact [ ]	No Impact [X]
c. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects).				
d. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

C. DETERMINATION

Based on the evaluation in FED (Environmental Effects Section), I find that the proposed Amendments, which propose changes to the Water Quality Control Plan for San Francisco Bay to incorporate the site-specific objectives and implementation plan for dissolved copper and nickel in Lower South SF Bay, will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Loretta Barsamian, Executive Officer  
San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST -- Phase 1 (Policy)

I.a.,b.,c.,e. Land use and planning (e.g., general plans and zoning) delineate those areas that will be developed, and the type and density of development to be allowed. There is nothing in the proposed amendments (to the Water Quality Control Plan for Region 2) that requires specific property to be used in any way or prohibits property uses.

I.d. The proposed amendments will not impact current agricultural activities

II.a.,b.,c. The proposed amendments will not affect population growth, development patterns or affect existing housing.

III.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.,f.,g.,i. None of the proposed amendments would create or exacerbate the geologic conditions outlined under these sections.

IV.a.,b.,d.,e.,f.,g.,h.,i. Implementation of the proposed amendments will not affect absorption rates, drainage patterns, surface runoff, flooding, and quantity of surface or ground water, surface water currents, or ground water flow or supply.

IV.c. The proposed amendments could potentially lead to higher concentrations of dissolved copper and nickel in the receiving waters since the site-specific objectives are higher than current ambient levels. This is deemed unlikely because of ongoing regulation of some major sources and the implementation plan. Additionally, the water quality surveillance plan will detect small increases in copper and nickel concentrations and trigger more aggressive pollution prevention actions.

V.a.,b.,c.,d. The proposed amendments is not expected to adversely affect air quality, result in increased exposure to sensitive species through the air pathway or result in changes in temperature, humidity, precipitation, winds, cloudiness, or other atmospheric conditions.

VI.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.,f.,g.; The proposed amendments will not impact existing transportation or traffic circulation patterns.

VII.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.;XVI.a. The proposed amendments are not expected to cause any significant adverse effects to plants and animals, including rare, threatened, or endangered species. The provisions of the proposed amendments could potentially lead to increases in ambient levels of dissolved copper and nickel in the waters of Lower South SF Bay, although such increases are not expected. Even if water quality did degrade to the point where ambient levels were at or just below the proposed site-specific objectives, there would be no likely, discernible impact on plants or animals. Further, because current loading to this portion of San Francisco Bay is much less than historical loading and is projected to remain lower, it is expected that the concentrations of nickel and especially copper in both the water and sediment of Lower South SF Bay will continue trending downward toward levels closer to those associated with natural

background conditions. While there is currently no evidence that copper or nickel is implicated in sediment toxicity, this downward loading trend should help alleviate concerns of such a connection.

VIII.a,b,c; The proposed amendments do not conflict with existing energy conservation plans, waste non-renewable resources, involve or affect the extraction or availability of mineral resources.

IX.a.,b.,e No impact to these specific areas is considered to be probable

IX.c.,d.;XVI.d. The proposed amendments will not cause adverse effects to human health.

XI.a.,b.,c.,d.,e. The proposed amendments will not have any impacts on the need for the specific public services identified in this section.

XII.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.,f.,g. The proposed amendments will not directly impact any utility or service systems.

XIII.a.,b.,c.; The proposed amendments will not directly impact designated scenic vistas or highways, will not have a demonstrable negative aesthetic affect, or result in increased glare.

XIV.a.,b.,c.,d.,e The proposed amendments will have no direct impact on any cultural resources.

XV.a,b. The proposed amendments will not directly increase the demand for recreational facilities or affect existing recreational opportunities.

XVI.a.b.,c.. The proposed amendments may result in lowering of water quality through slightly increased concentrations of dissolved copper and nickel although we do not anticipate this will occur. However, such increases in dissolved concentrations will not substantially degrade the quality of the environment or reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species or affect their populations in any fashion. There are certain phytoplankton species that are sensitive to dissolved copper at very low concentrations, and there is some uncertainty as to the impact increased levels would have on those sensitive species. One focus of the implementation program will be to reduce the uncertainty in this area. The proposed amendments are unlikely to result in impacts that are cumulatively considerable.